i3 Sustainability Rubric

A tool to help i3 grantees assess their readiness to sustain and scale

Purpose

The i3 sustainability rubric is designed to help i3 grantees asses their readiness to sustain and scale innovations. It is part of a suite of technical assistance focused on project implementation, sustainability, and dissemination funded by the U.S. Department of Education.

The rubric is designed to be used with i3 grantee teams, sites, and other key stakeholders to reflect on implementation practices during the grant period in ordre to identify implementation focus areas and next steps to achieve grantee sustainability and scaling up goals. The term "grantee" in the rubric refers to the organization or innovation to be sustained. The i3 sustainability rubric is rooted in effective practices of implementation and draws from sources such as *Deliverology* and the Reform Support Network.

The rubric is organized into three categories with thirteen elements (see chart below). The rubric asks users to rate each element based on a four-point scale from 1 to 4. The rubric includes descriptions of Weak (1) and Strong (4), as well as example look-fors to help grantees in the self-assessment process.

Rubric Overview

Grantee Capacity	Results and Performance Management	Stakeholder Support
1. Align organizational structure with goals 2. Build an organizational culture of professional learning 3. Extend capacity in the field 4. Extend capacity through partnerships	5. Set outcome targets to achieve goals 6. Develop plan(s) that align strategies with goals 7. Establish clear leadership of goals 8. Ensure quality data on implementation and performance is available and used to review progress and make mid-course corrections 9. Link internal and external accountability to results 10. Disseminate results to all stakeholders	11. Identify implementation sites aligned with goals 12. Strengthen stakeholder support and build a coalition 13. Build broad public support

Grantee Capacity

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
1. Align organizational structure with goals ■ Does the organizational structure facilitate the implementation and achievement of goals? ■ Does the grantee encourage collaboration across the organization, ensuring a focus on the goals rather than funding streams or individual programs? ■ Do all staff members understand how their work supports the goals? ■ Does the grantee understand what resources it will need to sustain over time?	■ The majority of the grantee's organizational structure is historic; the design is not deliberately aligned with goals. ■ Grantee staff members generally work within their areas and rarely communicate with other units or share information. ■ Individual staff and team goals are not aligned to grantee goals. ■ Recruiting has little or nothing to do with implementing and achieving the grantee's goals. ■ The grantee does not hold staff accountable for achieving goals. ■ The grantee has not identified what resources will be required to sustain or scale.	■ The grantee's organizational structure is anchored in its goals; while there is strong shared ownership, clear roles and lines of responsibility exist for implementation. ■ The grantee has cohesive cross-unit teams, where necessary, that maintain focus on implementing goals. ■ All staff members demonstrate a thorough understanding of how their individual work contributes to the goals. ■ The grantee actively recruits top talent from inside and outside the education field to ensure they have the skills and expertise necessary to implement. ■ The grantee holds staff accountable for outcomes and rewards top talent for exemplary work that contributes to the goals. ■ There is a clear set of options identified or being pursued for resources to sustain and/or scale.	■ The grantee has dedicated staff working on implementing goals. ■ A team gathers regularly to focus on goals; these teams write shared values aligned to goals and use them for making decisions. ■ Robust formal and informal mechanisms exist to gather feedback and collaborate with partners in advisory and decision-making capacities. ■ Staff can articulate how their work contributes to goals. ■ Staff raise issues to leadership for quick resolution. ■ Decisions to recruit, retain, promote and dismiss staff are grounded in the goals. ■ Staff know what is expected of them and take initiative to move the work forward (for example, staff can appropriately manage up and are not overly dependent on managers for direction). ■ Financial model is in place to inform and address sustainability and scaling up.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
2. Build an organizational culture of professional learning ■ Is there a culture of professional learning that extends to every staff member? ■ Is the culture anchored in a regular formative assessment of each individual's skills, strengths and areas of growth with respect to supporting goals? ■ Does that assessment drive robust professional learning?	■ Little or no formative assessment of staff skills occurs; where it does, it is at the initiative of individuals rather than as a result of grantee practice. ■ The practice of summative assessment of staff is a formality or viewed as an unpleasant element of the grantee culture. ■ The grantee offers few, if any, professional learning opportunities; those that it does offer are disconnected from any understanding of the needs or growth opportunities of staff. ■ Professional growth takes place at the initiative of individuals, if it occurs at all.	■ Every individual in the organization takes responsibility for providing and seeking substantive feedback that drives their own professional growth and that of their manager(s), their team and their colleagues to develop the skills needed to implement and contribute to goals. ■ Every staff member excels in feedback and coaching, and the practice is pervasive before and after every opportunity in the work of the grantee. ■ The grantee does not distinguish between "professional learning" time and other time; every moment is considered an opportunity for improvement, punctuated by formal training that is tailored to individual needs. ■ The grantee is a true learning organization, where every member of the staff continuously builds skills and acquires additional responsibility; the grantee is continuously developing and expanding the human capital that can implement and help to achieve goals.	■ Formative assessment (for example, feedback meetings, and reflections on progress) is a common and regular practice. ■ High-quality protocols and/or grantee-defined practices exist for employee reviews and formative feedback. ■ Written employee reviews and/or formative assessments are of high quality. ■ There is a schedule or resources to support professional learning and a process for deciding what to offer, to whom and when. ■ Staff members provide feedback indicating that they feel a culture of continuous improvement exists; skill and competence of managers is high; and formative and summative assessment processes are strong. ■ There is a high number and/or percent of highly talented mid and senior leaders that were "grown" from within.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
3. Extend capacity in the field ■ Does the grantee ensure that the sites are empowered and equipped to deliver on the goals? ■ Is there a critical mass of leaders in the field aligned with grantee efforts to implement? ■ Are sites equipped with the necessary knowledge, skills and competencies to implement? ■ Does the grantee focus on guidance and support to implementation sites?	■ The grantee provides support to the implementation sites that is too limited to make a significant impact. ■ The grantee relies primarily on policy and/or compliance monitoring to make change in implementation. ■ The grantee does little to support the sites and capacity to implement project goals varies widely as a result. ■ Relationships and communication with the implementation sites is challenging. Sites do not have shared ownership of goals.	■ Sites have a common understanding of the supports that are aligned with goals; the vast majority of supports sites receive are consistent and aligned. ■ Sites support themselves through a network that functions as a professional learning community; the network continuously builds local capacity to implement. ■ Site leaders push each other and hold each other accountable for this work in an ongoing dialogue about performance. ■ The grantee continuously examines ways in which it can improve supports and does so in a collaborative manner. ■ The grantee encourages staff to innovate; empowers them to make decisions; and, supports them to learn from mistakes -- in order to improve service to the implementation sites. ■ Sites consider the grantee a true partner.	■ All implementation sites have access to high-quality support aligned to goals (for example, professional learning opportunities, convenings, networks of leaders, and materials and resources for implementation). ■ The support is differentiated based on need and is offered to all implementation sites. ■ Leaders in the field give consistently positive feedback about the grantee and are demanding more and more of them (for example, available seats for professional learning opportunities, formal feedback submitted, etc.).

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
4. Extend capacity through partnerships ■ Do the grantee's ongoing relationships with partners and external stakeholder groups give it the necessary capacity to achieve and implement? ■ Are the goals of the grantee sufficiently aligned with those of the most critical partners, so that this type of relationship is possible and productive? ■ Are the roles and expertise of the grantee's partners well suited to the needs?	■ Given staffing and competing or pressing demands, the grantee considers engaging external partners and stakeholder groups to assist with goals a low priority. ■ The grantee is reluctant to engage in partnership or is stymied in its attempts to form partnerships that expand its capacity. ■ Potential partners, such as local foundations and advocacy groups, pursue reforms that run counter to the grantee's goals. ■ The combined capacity of the grantee and external stakeholder groups is less than the sum of its parts.	■ Nearly all grantee action on project goals leverages one or more external partnerships that provide critical expertise for effective project implementation. ■ Partners are identified and selected based on shared project goals and complimentary expertise to the grantee. ■ The roles for the grantee and partners (national, regional and local) are well established and regularly revisited. Partners have shared accountability for project success. ■ The combined capacity of the grantee and external stakeholder groups is more than the sum of its parts; the grantee and stakeholder groups work together toward the same agenda to implement and reach project goals.	■ Nearly all grantee action on leverages one or more external partnerships. ■ Grantee staff work seamlessly with and through external partners and stakeholder groups in their day-to-day work. ■ The most critical partners act as true extensions of the grantee.

Results and Performance Management

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
5. Set outcome targets to achieve goals ■ Has the grantee articulated its goals in terms of specific, measurable targets, including at least one for student achievement? ■ Do the targets represent a significant wild success for the innovation and for students? Do they address equity between student subgroups as well as absolute performance? ■ Are they aligned with similar outcomes being set at the local level? ■ Are the goals and outcomes well understood and shared by a wide range of stakeholder groups?	■ The grantee has not defined clear targets for its goals. ■ Any targets that have been defined are subject to interpretation. ■ If targets exist, they have little or no resonance outside the grantee—either in the implementation sites, partners, or with external stakeholder groups.	■ Implementation sites and the grantee share ownership of a comprehensive set of goals and targets. ■ Data analysis and other evidence show that the targets are ambitious but achievable. ■ These targets are reinforced both by popular support and by accountability mechanisms. ■ Taken together, the goals and targets create a sense of urgency and momentum to achieve them.	■ Each target has specific parameters (for example, a single measurable metric, baseline data, a target with an end date, and interim targets for each intervening year). ■ Each target is backed by rigorous data analysis (for example, benchmarking against historical performance; against other similar innovations; and, against high and low performers) and/or a needs analysis of disaggregated historical performance. ■ There is a clear link between grantee targets and the most salient targets for districts and schools. ■ Educators, external stakeholder groups and local leaders have clearly been engaged to support these goals (for example, they co-developed them; were part of a communications strategy around them; and, can name and defend them).

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
6. Develop plan(s) that align strategies with goals ■ Does the grantee have plan(s) that articulate its goals, theory of action, and strategies? ■ Does the plan show how the grantee will implement its strategies at scale? ■ Does the plan show how implementing each strategy will contribute to the goals? ■ Does the plan drive the day-to-day work of those who will be responsible for implementing the strategies? ■ Does the plan incorporate elements of sustainability (and possibly scaling up)?	■ The grantee may have a plan, but it does not present a coherent picture of what the grantee is trying to accomplish or how. ■ The plan bears little or no relationship to roles in implementation. ■ The descriptions of strategies give little or no sense of the scale at which they will be implemented or how this will be achieved. ■ The strategies have no clearly articulated connection to expected outputs leading to desired outcomes. ■ Strategies at implementation sites are undertaken almost entirely and exclusively as a result of local initiative. ■ The plan does not reference sustainability or scaling up of effective practices.	■ The grantee has a plan that articulates its goals, theory of action and strategies so well that it serves as the basis for communicating and engaging stakeholder groups about the grantee's work, including sustainability and/or scaling up. ■ The plan gives details of each individual strategy and identifies interdependencies between strategies and how they will be addressed in implementation. ■ The plan uses evidence to estimate how the strategies will build on and interact with one another to reach grantee goals. ■ The plan is a living document that forms the basis for dialogue and partnership between the grantee, implementation sites, partners, and stakeholder groups about implementation and progress toward goals.	■ Grantee plan exists. Leaders, staff, partners, and sites often refer to it. ■ The plan specifies a defined set of strategies for implementation, sustainability, dissemination, and scaling up (if relevant). ■ The plan uses the evidence available to make educated estimates of the impact of each strategy on the goal. ■ Grantee staff and others responsible for implementing the plan refer to it as the most significant guidance they use in their work. ■ The grantee has recently updated the plan (for example, within the last 6–12 months) to reflect current realities. ■ Site implementation plans contain implicit or explicit references to grantee goals and strategies.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
7. Establish clear leadership of goals ■ Has the grantee assigned clear and accountable leadership for each of its goals? ■ Do these leaders have a working relationship with the leads that facilitates their leadership? ■ Do these leaders marshal the necessary resources (people, time, technology, and money) to carry out their responsibilities?	■ The grantee has not assigned clear roles and responsibilities with respect to its goals, creating confusion and bottlenecks in decision-making. ■ Authority for final decisions is not clear; decisions on implementing goals are made ad hoc by various members of the leadership team and others in the organization. ■ Leaders' use of resources is mostly dictated by the functions that exist within their organizational units, not shared organizational goals. ■ Grantee staff is hesitant to implement goals until top-level decisions are made.	■ In addition to their individual responsibility, leaders of the goals and/or strategies form a coherent team that takes collective responsibility for implementation. ■ The lead relies on, empowers, and supports this team to work collaboratively to achieve and implement goals. ■ Each leader collaborates with their implementation sites and partners to identify resources and expertise to implement and achieve goals. ■ The grantee has integrated teams that are empowered by their leaders to do what is necessary to implement and achieve goals.	■ The grantee has organized its leadership around goals and strategies (one leader per strategy). ■ Grantee leadership and staff can name the accountable leader for each goal/strategy. ■ The lead has a support and accountability relationship with each leader that is anchored on the goal/strategy for which they are responsible. ■ Leaders are assigned so that most (but inevitably not all) resources necessary to their work are within their lines of authority. ■ There are protocols in place for communicating with the lead, having access to his/her time and getting decisions made. ■ Grantee staff provides positive feedback on the culture of collaboration and teamwork at the organization. ■ Partners' roles in implementation are clear and critical partners are part of the leadership team.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
8. Ensure quality data on implementation and performance is available and used to review progress and make mid-course corrections ■ Do the grantee, implementation sites, partners, and stakeholders have access to valid, frequent and useful data on performance and implementation against goals? ■ Are there clearly defined processes, systems, and routines for collecting, verifying, analyzing and reporting on implementation and performance data? ■ Does the grantee regularly use performance and implementation data to problem solve and generate actionable learning?	■ The grantee has disorganized and poorly defined systems and processes for data collection, verification, analysis and reporting. ■ Current systems provide data that are incomplete, invalid or unreliable. ■ Grantee analysis of these data is haphazard, ad hoc and may bear little relationship to goals. ■ The grantee does not systemically use data to guide its decision making about the implementation of goals. ■ Leaders do not take a deliberate approach to understanding whether their work has an impact on goals; any efforts to do this are limited to longer-term research. ■ There is hesitation to surface real challenges from the data because participants fear accountability for results. ■ The grantee has no common practice for decision-making.	■ The data are trusted, shared, and heavily used by all stakeholders. ■ The grantee's systems and processes collect feedback regularly and systemically, including leading and lagging indicators of performance and qualitative feedback from implementation sites. ■ The grantee staff, partners, and implementation sites regularly analyze these data to identify conclusions about implementation and the efficacy of strategies. ■ The grantee has regular routines, informed by data, to reach a shared understanding of implementation, progress toward goals, lessons learned, and to identify next steps. ■ Problem-solving results in clear decision-making based on evidence and builds strong, productive working relationships; through these relationships, people hold each other accountable for making decisions based on data.	■ Stakeholder groups widely anticipate grantee data releases. ■ The grantee works with sites to develop protocols for collecting feedback that utilizes a variety of feedback loops (for example, surveys, focus groups, interviews, site visits, reviews of artifacts of practice). ■ The grantee develops and continuously refines a set of "standard" analyses of feedback that isolates strategies and estimates their impact on goals. ■ The grantee creates a system of similar routines for its engagement with sites and connects it to planning and accountability. ■ For most major decisions on practice, resource allocation, staffing and/or funding, leaders can point to the evidence that justifies the decisions. ■ The self-monitoring in these routines informs the grantee's external reporting on performance (for example, to USED, a board, partners, stakeholder groups).

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
9. Link internal and external accountability to results ■ Do data on performance and quality of implementation have real consequences for the grantee's work? ■ Does the grantee have well-designed recruitment and accountability structures that hold staff appropriately accountable for results? ■ Does the grantee use data to hold partners and implementation sites accountable for performance by setting clear and specific performance expectations?	■ Most of the grantee's practices exist for historical or political reasons; the grantee rarely uses data to adjust these practices. ■ The grantee's staffing, organization, funding and resource allocation change slowly over time, and/or these changes are rarely driven by data, and/or they change frequently, but based on personal impulse. ■ The grantee's human capital management is almost entirely disconnected from data on performance or quality of implementation. ■ The grantee does not translate goals into clear expectations for implementation sites. ■ The grantee uses data to assess partner and site performance, but it is not clear how the data relates back to site performance expectations.	■ The grantee continuously and rapidly updates its practices on data as their efficacy become available; the grantee works closely with sites to test, refine and continuously improve this body of work. ■ The grantee is a fluid entity that continuously and rapidly updates its staffing, organization, funding and resource allocation in response to these changes in practices. ■ The grantee has worked with the implementation sites to set and agree on performance expectations that are linked to goals. ■ The grantee differentiates its supports to sites based on a variety of factors, including data on performance and quality of implementation; it adjusts quickly as new data become available. ■ The grantee's system of rewards and recognition addresses absolute performance, progress and implementation quality.	■ There is evidence that strategies and practices have been discontinued based on performance and implementation data. ■ The grantee has processes for making quick staffing, organization, funding, and resource decisions based on data. ■ The grantee has negotiated and formalized performance expectations with implementation sites and partners (for example, through performance compacts, improvement planning, and expectations laid out in working agreements). ■ The grantee has a clear set of criteria and rules for how rewards and recognition are determined and applied.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
10. Disseminate results to all stakeholders ■ Do stakeholder groups and the public understand and support the implications of current performance for the grantee's work? ■ Does the grantee have a consistent and transparent message about current performance and its implications for the work? ■ Does the grantee engage stakeholder groups and the public with this message?	■ The grantee may release analyses of results, but the implications do not go much further than "good news" or "bad news". ■ The grantee makes few if any attempts to engage stakeholders about results. ■ As a result, stakeholder groups and the public are left to draw their own conclusions about what results mean.	■ The grantee continuously develops and refines its messages about results and implications as information becomes available on outcomes and quality of implementation. ■ The grantee uses these messages to engage stakeholder groups and the public in a consistent and transparent dialogue about the current state of performance and implementation. ■ There is momentum and excitement among stakeholder groups about the goals and the part each will play in achieving them. ■ The grantee uses each engagement opportunity to expand potential partnerships for sustaining and scaling up effective practices that will significantly impact student achievement.	■ The grantee includes messages about results and implications in a prominent manner, including reference to results of independent evaluations. ■ The grantee has a written strategy for disseminating results to all stakeholders that differentiates messages to different groups and uses multiple media, including social media; this strategy is part of a broader sustainability and/or scaling-up plan. ■ Feedback from stakeholder groups and the public suggests that they: 1) understand the grantee goals; 2) agree with the grantee's perspective on what must be done; 3) believe that their voices are being heard and reflected in grantee action; and 4) are able/willing to play their part in supporting the grantee's goals.

Stakeholder Support

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
11. Identify implementation sites aligned with goals ■ Are future implementation sites identified based on alignment with grantee goals? ■ Do sustaining implementation sites (after the i3 grant award ends) align with and support grantee goals? ■ Is this alignment reflected in resource allocation and budgeting? ■ Is this alignment reflected in key partners at the different levels in the district, region/county, or state?	■ Future implementation sites are identified based on interest alone. ■ Sustaining implementation sites vary in implementation and alignment to grantee goals. ■ Sites view their work in relative isolation from that of other implementation sites. ■ Resources are not aligned to implementation priorities at the site level. ■ Key partners at the district, region/county, and state levels are not aligned with the grantee's goals after the i3 funds disappear.	■ Implementation sites are identified based on alignment to mission, grantee goals, and need -- independent of resources available to support implementation. ■ Sustaining implementation sites prioritize funding and implementation, aligned to the grantee goals. ■ Grantee establishes partnerships with implementation sites where there is a strong alignment of regional and local priorities. ■ As a result, the local context of sites helps to drive the successful implementation of grantee goals.	■ There is evidence of a common agenda among implementation sites and partners (ideally written). ■ The grantee engages frequently with leaders of other education organizations and sites to maintain alignment. ■ Alignment focuses on the intersections and overlaps between the work of the grantee, partners, and sites.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
12. Strengthen stakeholder support and build a coalition ■ Is there a critical mass of relevant stakeholder groups that understand and support the grantee's goals and sustainability? ■ Does the grantee engage these stakeholder groups through a deliberate strategy that is designed to build this support? ■ Does this strategy distinguish its approach to different stakeholder groups, both in the messaging and in the means of engagement? ■ Does the work of these various organizations support, complement and build upon the work of the others? ■ Would these organizations continue to work in support of the grantee even without funding from i3?	■ The grantee has no specific strategy for engaging with stakeholder groups relative to goals. ■ The grantee has a poor understanding of the stakeholder groups it will need to reach; leaders may understand a few of them, but tend to treat "stakeholders" as one large audience rather than differentiating. ■ The grantee has no specific strategy for communicating with or otherwise engaging stakeholder groups. Leaders have little sense of the current level of support for grantee goals in most stakeholder groups. ■ The grantee does not actively engage key leaders to collaborate on the goals. ■ Partners and stakeholder groups would not be engaged without the financial contribution of i3.	■ The grantee participates in and helps coordinate an engagement effort to build support for goals. ■ In addition to its differentiated approach to key stakeholder groups, the engagement strategy is integrated with the core work of the grantee itself. ■ Implementation sites are equal partners with the grantee in shaping and pursuing the engagement strategy; they bring maximum credibility to communications and other forms of engagement with local stakeholder groups. ■ The grantee collects quantitative and qualitative feedback to regularly assess the impact of the engagement strategy on stakeholder group support and adjust its work accordingly. ■ The drive to achieve grantee goals is a movement built on local strength, capable of enduring leadership changes. ■ Engagement and implementation will continue after i3 funding, with communities adjusting to continue the focus on grantee goals and implementation.	■ The grantee dedicates significant and senior staff resources to the leadership of their communications work as part of a broad engagement strategy. ■ The engagement strategy is captured in a written plan that clearly differentiates the most critical stakeholders, is connected to other reform plans and drives ongoing work. ■ Local stakeholder groups are prominently featured in the engagement strategy, and local leaders play a significant role in carrying it out. ■ Feedback is collected and regularly examined from key stakeholder groups through surveys, polls, focus groups, interviews and other creative mechanisms. ■ Leaders of stakeholder groups regularly advocate on behalf of or work to support grantee goals.

Elements & Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Look-Fors
13. Build broad public support ■ Is there strong public support for grantee goals? ■ Does the grantee demonstrate a commitment to making the case for the public value of the goals? ■ Does the grantee identify, cultivate and coordinate "champions" for the goals—including leaders of education organizations, site leaders and leaders of other stakeholder groups—to build public confidence in its impact? ■ Does the grantee ensure that there is high visibility and understanding of the goals? ■ Is this work driven by regular feedback on the larger public opinion and public value of the goals?	■ Grantee leadership has shown very little evidence of making a commitment to building the case for the public value of the goals. ■ The grantee has not devoted time, attention or resources to building public commitment to the goals. ■ The grantee has made no attempt to engage potential champions who could speak out in support of the goals. ■ The grantee has little or no sense of public sentiment and has no strong mechanism to gauge it. ■ There is unchecked and disproportionately loud opposition to the grantee's goals.	■ The grantee and a critical mass of local leaders share a common commitment to making the case for the public value. ■ Grantee strategies for building public value influence the tone of all interactions, so that there is a culture of building public value throughout the organization. ■ There is an extensive and self-sustaining network of engaged and active champions that are fully integrated into these strategies as both co-authors and executors of them. ■ Grantee leadership actively listens to and shapes the public conversation around the goals; they have a consistent sense of public sentiment and are dynamically responsive to it. ■ The grantee's goals have irreversible grassroots support and there is a sustained push to implement them.	■ The grantee devotes significant time and energy to issues of public value; their public statements show consistent support for the goals. ■ All pertinent communications of the grantee are designed to build public support for the goals. ■ Grantee leaders can name the circle of core champions; they present a united message on the goals and they lead the effort to build public support independent of the grantee. ■ There is evidence of independent support for the grantee's goals (for example, from editorial boards, thought leaders, stakeholder organizations or other similar venues). ■ There is strong positive public feedback (for example, through surveys, focus groups, and polling) on the grantee's goals; levels of support are much higher than anything that the grantee could achieve with its own resources.